Mythopoeic Society MYTHLORE A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature

Volume 13
Number 4

Article 20

6-15-1987

That "Hideous Strength" in Lewis and Orwell: A Comparison and Contrast

Peter J. Schakel

Mythcon 51: A VIRTUAL “HALFLING” MYTHCON

July 31 - August 1, 2021 (Saturday and Sunday)
http://www.mythsoc.org/mythcon/mythcon-51.htm

Mythcon 52: The Mythic, the Fantastic, and the Alien

Albuquerque, New Mexico; July 29 - August 1, 2022
http://www.mythsoc.org/mythcon/mythcon-52.htm

Abstract

Although both Orwell and Lewis warned against the evils of totalitarianism in their novels, they did it from different theological and political perspectives. Both mythopoeic works recognize the danger in attempts to destroy myth.

Additional Keywords

Lewis, C.S. That Hideous Strength; Myth in C.S. Lewis; Myth in George Orwell; Orwell, George—As mythopoeic author; Orwell, George. Animal Farm; Orwell, George. 1984

That "Hideous Strength" in Lewis and Orwell

A Comparison and Contrast

Peter J. Schakel

On the face of it, C.S. Lewis and George Orwell seem totally dissimilar men. The one is a political conservative, the other a socialist and revolutionary (for, though Orwell was and is admired by conservative anti-communist Malcolm Muggeridge, one must remember that he advocated Democratic Socialism throughout his life, went to Spain to support the revolutionary cause there, and, if not a Trotskyite, held views in common with Trotskyites in the late 1930s). The one was an evangelical Christian, the other rejected organized religion throughout his life -- though Orwell asked to be buried in a churchyard with proper Anglican services, which indicates a certain sympathy with (or nostalgia about) Christianity late in his life. For most of his life, however, he scorned the Church, partly on religious, partly on political, grounds. Lewis' comments on Orwell are limited to Orwell's works: he thought Animal Farm excellent, Nineteen Eighty-Four flawed [1]. Orwell's only recorded references to Lewis are hostile. In 1944 he devoted half of an "As I Please" column to Beyond Personality, dismissing it as "a kind of book that has been endemic in England quite sixty years... the silly-clever book, which goes on the principle not of threatening the unbeliever with Hell, but of showing him up as an illogical ass" [2]. And in a letter in 1949, Orwell, commenting on T.S. Eliot's approval of Charles Williams' novels, added "It wouldn't surprise me to learn that Eliot approves of C.S. Lewis as well" (Ibid, IV, 504). Despite their differences, however, there are points in common and similarities between them which can illuminate the ideas and artistic achievements of both men.

Lewis and Orwell were of the same generation -- Lewis born in 1898 in Belfast, the son of a solicitor, grandson of a manufacturer-businessman on one side, of a clergyman on the other; Orwell born in Bengal in 1903, son of a lower echelon civil servant, grandson of an indigent aristocrat bishop and a businessman of reduced fortunes. Both were members of what Orwell called the "lower-upper class," Lewis slightly higher in it than Orwell. Both had access to the best in British educations, Lewis at Cherbourg House, Malvern College, and Oxford, Orwell at St. Cyprian's and Eton. Both valued solid, old-fashioned British rationalism (Lewis' a Christian rationalism, Orwell's a humanistic rationalism) and traditional British decency, humane values, and culture. [3]

Both thought of themselves as "outsiders," as not being part of the "establishment." That was, in fact, far more true of Orwell than of Lewis. Lewis considered himself an "outsider" in part because of his Irish background, in part because he was not wealthy, in part because his conservative Christianity set him apart from his peers. Dispite all that he clearly did identify with the upper class and the establishment in many ways -- he was in comfortable economic circumstances after he received his fellowship at Magdalen College and began publishing books, conservative in his social and political views, a member of the Church of England, at ease with social and ecclesiastical hierarchies. He was opposed to "progress" and seemed more desirous of moving backward to the best of the past than of moving forward to an uncertain future. He valued imagination in others, and showed a keen, though limited, imagination himself. Orwell on the other hand, identified with the working class and the poor. He himself was near the poverty-level much of his life, a socialist and revolutionary, rejecting the church and religion. He was egalitarian in social outlook, forward-looking, progressive, although he wanted that progress to be based on values retained from the past. He valued imagination in others, but tended himself to emphasize practical, down-to-earth qualities more highly than imaginative ones.

Such common and contrasting elements form the background for similarities and differeneces between Lewis' That Hideous Strength and Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. The two books were published at about the same time, 1945 and 1948 respectively, in response to the same perceived danger of totalitarianism -- the Nazism of the past and the Stalinism of the present. Both authors depict the dehumanization and despoilation of life which would occur under such a regime, as a means of warning readers against the threat such organizations pose; but the characteristics each focuses on reveal significant differences in their outlooks. And though neither author shows in these books the process by which the totalitarian group takes power, both suggest here or describe elsewhere how it occured, and in so doing display very different social and economic concerns.

Nineteen Eighty-Four traces a few crucial months in the life of Winston Smith, a minor bureaucrat in Oceania, one of the three superpowers which dominate the world in 1984. Life in Oceania is grim. There is no privacy: day and night, at home, at work, and in the streets, all people except the laboring classes (the proles, or proletariat), who are not considered a threat to the state -- or even human, are observed by two-way telescreens; posters everywhere proclaim BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU. Winston is employed in the Ministry of Truth, rewriting old newspaper stories to conform with current official Party versions of what occurred. Newspeak (a contracted language which makes it impossible for its users to express, or even conceive of, unorthodox opinions or ideas) and Doublethink (the ability to accept an idea and its opposite simultaneously) prevent readers from noticing the changes. But Winston never learned Doublethink. The Party does not control him mentally: he can still raise questions and think critically and commit such Thought-crimes as "Down With Big Brother." The story follows Winston as he begins a love affair with Julia, a co-worker in his building, and as he attempts to find and join a subversive organization. It turns out, however, that the Thought Police have long had Winston and Julia under surveillance as possible rebels. They are arrested, taken to the Ministry of Love, tortured, brainwashed, and broken. The story ends with Winston realizing that now "he loves Big Brother."

Central to the story is the theme of dehumanization. Orwell's original choice of a title for the book was "The Last Man in Europe." Winston was

apparently the last man in Oceania who had not been brainwashed by the Party's propaganda and who had escaped the effects of Thought-control; thus he was the last person in Europe to retain the qualities of the free use of intellect and moral choice, qualities that for Orwell and Lewis alike give a person his or her humanity. "If you are a man, Winston," says O'Brien, his torturer, "you are the last man. Your kind is extinct." [4] According to the Party, the masses, the manual-laborers and the lower classes (the Proletariat, or "Proles") are considered sub-human. "The proles are not human beings," Syme tells Winston early on; and later O'Brien says, "They are helpless, like the animals" (1984, pp. 47, 222). Animal imagery, in fact,is used throughout the book for those outside the Innner Party as well as for the Proles, which reinforces the dehumanization theme. Homo sapiens continue to exist, but as animals, totally trained and regulated and controlled, not as human beings. The central purpose of Orwell's story is to warn that such elimination of human beings is inevitable, ultimate, and most devastating result of a totalitarian government.

That it is inevitable is asserted and clarified by Lewis as well as Orwell. Lewis, in The Abolition of Man, warned that if rulers cease to have basic human values -- including unselfishness and a desire to serve others -- as their guides and norms, the only persons who would be willing to rule would be those who take pleasure in having power over others. In That Hideous Strength having power over others is the inducement for joining the totalitarian group: "Man has got to take charge of Man. That means, remember, that some men have got to take charge of the rest -- which is another reason for cashing in on it as soon as one can. You and I want to be the people who do the taking charge, not the ones who are taken charge of." (THS, p. 42) To take charge of Man is to treat human beings as things, as objects over which man seeks control. So it is in Oceania too, where the incentive is simply and wholly the possession of power. O'Brien tells Winston, "The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power." (1984, p. 217)

Nineteen Eighty-Four does not explain how those who possess power, those in the Inner Party, came to possess it. That process is portrayed, however, in Orwell's earlier book, Animal Farm. It depicts allegorically the revolution of the exploited working class (the proletariat) against the monied, managerial class -- and clearly Orwell is sympathetic with that revolution. The uprising oof the animals against Farmer Jones and their establishment of a socialistic economic system based on equality, of status, work, and rewards, is the sort of peaceful but decisive revolution of the laboring classes Orwell hoped would occur in England during or immediately after World War II. But the theme of Animal Farm as a whole is not revolution, but the revolution betrayed. The latter half of the book shows how the pigs gradually assert priority over the other animals ("All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others" [5]), form an Inner Party which seizes power, and impose repressive restraints and controls over the other animals. At the end of the book, the pigs move into the farmhouse and become indistinguishable from Farmer Jones -- as the policies of the Communist party in the Soviet Union became barely distinguishable from those of the Czar, against whose tyrrany the people revolted in 1917. Both Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four are satires, warnings against the likely culmination of tendencies Orwell saw in his society in the 1930s and '40s, not a realistic prediction of what would occur. Orwell himself summed up his message well: "Something like Nineteen Eighty-Four could happen.... Don't let it happen. It depends on you." [6]

That Hideous Strength, which Lewis called "A Modern Fairy-Tale for Grown-Ups," describes the expansion and growing threat posed by, and ultimately the defeat of, a totalitarian plot in contemporary England. The plot is quite simple. One half traces the involvement of a young don of Bracton College, Mark Studdock, in the N.I.C.E. (the National Institute for Coordinated Experiments), a socio-political organization whose aim is to gain total, absolute power over the political and social structures of England and thus over the lives of individuals. Mark participates in the Institute's moves to seize control of the city of Edgestow, first by dominating it economically, then by subverting its administrative structures, then by turning it into police state. This is the initial step in their scheme to control all England, and later to link up with similar totalitarian groups around the world. The other half of the plot focuses on Mark's wife Jane, who aligns herself with an organization opposed to the N.I.C.E.. This group, living in the Manor at St. Anne's, has gathered aound Elwin Ransom, whose adventures on Mars (in Out of the Silent Planet) and especially on Venus (in Perelandra) have rendered him superhuman, a type of Christ. Jane comes personally to accept the religious-humanistic values the St. Anne's group embodies and her clairvoyant powers are a crucial factor in its destruction of the N.I.C.E..

In That Hideous Strength as in Nineteen Eighty-Four the dehumanizing effect of a totalitarian government is stressed. The social planners, police, and bureaucrats of the N.I.C.E. deprives humans of their freedom and dignity as fully as do the Pigs and the Party in Orwell's works. Dehumanization in the N.I.C.E. occurs chiefly in two ways. First, in their determination to gain complete conquest of nature, the N.I.C.E. comes to treat human beings as only another part of nature, a proper subject for experimentation. Thus, in the headquarters at Belbury, convicted criminals (like Mrs. Maggs' husband) are caged up alongside the menagerie of animals collected for vivisection. They are dehumanized, second, by the very allegiance which makes them members -- or inner members, at least, of the organization. Mark learns that, if he is to become a member of the inner circle of the N.I.C.E., he must destroy all moral sensitivity -- he must contract to a physical-cerebral shell like Whither, or become a hard, cold logical machine like Frost, devoid of human responses. He learns the N.I.C.E.'s ideal is a decapitated Head, kept functioning by a machine which circulates juices and oxygen through it. That he is able to resist the pressure to follow Frost and Whither is the first step in moral growth and maturing for him.

But dehumanization is not the fundamental theme for Lewis, as it is for Orwell. At an even deeper level, Lewis' book depicts the struggle of Good vs. Evil. The N.I.C.E. is not just a totalitarian organization, but a diabolical one: its ultimate leaders are not humans like Wither and Frost, or even the bodiless Head being kept alive by Filostrato's machines, but the bent Eldils of earth -- fallen angels, demons, emissaries of the devil. They are the Hideous Strength which lies behind the N.I.C.E. and which are being opposed by the Christ-figure Ransom and his followers. Ultimately, thus, Lewis' book becomes a modern

novelist's equivalent to a medieval morality play, with its warnings about the social and personal effects of evil. It is in that light that the end of the book must be viewed. As the N.I.C.E.'s power expands and intensifies, the Oyarsas (guardian angels, spiritual powers) of the planets Mercury, Venus, Mars, Saturn, and Jupiter descend to earth, join with Merlin the Magician, reawakened after sleeping fifteen centuries, and quickly, easily destroy the N.I.C.E., though the Hideous Strength which lies bshind it is only set back, not defeated. It is an unabashedly deus exmachina ending -- the gods literally do come down -- which fits nicely the overall theme of the morality story: Evil ultimately cannot stand up to the Good and will be utterly defeated in the end. And the book is a call to readers to align themselves with the Good -- to accept the objective values of traditional morality (what Lewis in The Abolition of Man called the Tao), as Mark Studdock does by choosing the side of the sweet and straight, the "Normal," when Frost attempts to make him embrace the sour and the crooked, and as Jane does in her slow movement toward conversion to Christianity. Only by acceptance and reliance on the Good, on the values of the Tao, Lewis affirms, is there hope for resistance to the growing threat of totalitarian rule with its inevitable elimination of human freedom and dignity.

Nowhere in That Hideous Strength does Lewis specify how the N.I.C.E. came into being. One can infer that a small group of men desirous of power over others discovered the existence and strength of the Macrobes, or fallen eldils. To use that knowledge, these men took advantage of the contemporary esteem for specialists, especially scientists, and created the N.I.C.E. as a front to mask their real methods and objectives. The publicized purpose of the N.I.C.E. is to get "science applied to social problems and backed by the whole force of the state" (p. 38); the public is led to believe that the N.I.C.E. will solve "the unemployment problem, the cancer problem, the housing problem, the problems of currency, or war, of education" and provide "a brighter, cleaner and fuller life for our children" (p. 133). In fact its aim is to control and direct the lives of the populace, beginning with such measures as sterilization of the unfit, liquidation of backward races, selective breeding, and "real eduction" -- the type which "makes the patient what it wants infallibly" (p. 42; emphasis added). All of this reflects Lewis' "dread [of] specialists in power" and suspicion of social scientists -- his fear, in general, about the treatment of non-scientific subjects through quasi-scientific methods, particularly as the objectives of a popularizied science, or "scientism," are united with the structures and strengths of government. [7]

But it also, unintentionally perhaps, reflects Lewis' political outlook, which contrasts sharply and interestingly with Orwell's. Orwell identifies with and clearly sympathizes with the proletariat, the working classes who end up exploited before the revolution (in Britain of the 1930s and '40s) and after (in Oceania of the 1980s). Lewis, on the other hand, gives little attention in his works to the laboring classes. They do not appear as characters in his stories (except perhaps for Frank, the cabby, in The Magician's Nephew, who hardly is typical), and he does not refer to them in his essays. The glimpses we have of the proletariat show them as employed, hard-working, humble, solidly patriotic types who know when they are well off, are content with their lot in life, and would become involved with, or receptive to, radical social change only if they were manipulated from above. No need for major social change is evident in Lewis' writings, though he lived through the same decades as Orwell and could have seen, perhaps should have seen, evidence of the same social problems. One finds in Lewis no reference to the huge gap that then existed between the extremely rich and the very poor, or to the repressiveness of the fairly rigid class system, or to the cruelties of unemployment, inadequate wages, and poverty. Little of Birmingham, Sheffield, and Wigan Pier is evident, it appears, from the sheltered recesses of Oxford. Religiously and economically Lewis had sympathy for the down-and-outers and desired an improved lot for them. But not politically -- an important part of the Old Westen myth he clung to endorse hierarchy and resisted change, unless it involved a return to the even more patriarchal society of the past. That Hideous Strength is a deeply political book because it is fundamentally an anti-revolutionary book (that may account in part for Lewis' popularity among conservative Christians in America today). As That Hideous Strength sets things forth, social "revolution" would come completely from the top down and it is undercut by being identified with wild fanatics like Straik. Thus it is interesting to hear Orwell claim for Lewis' religious writings, not just his stories, a reactionary political effect if not intent: Lewis' "chummy little wireless talks," Orwell wrote, "are not really so unpolitical as they are meant to look. Indeed they are an outflanking movement in the big counterattack against the Left which Lord Elton, A.P. Herbert, G.M. Young, Alfred Noyes and various others have been conducting for two years past." (Essays, III, 265) Lewis' interests lay chiefly in the moral-spiritual struggle of the upper-middle class to which he, and his characters, and probably his readers, belong, not in the fight for political-economic justice and freedom for the lower classes which was Orwell's constant concern.

Of elements which link Orwell and Lewis, that of greatest interest at this conference is myth. Nineteen Eighty-Four is at one level, in some respects its deepest level, a story about an effort to eliminate myth. A crucial purpose for the introduction of Newspeak is to eliminate connotations, or, as Syme the philologist, calls it, vagueness and useless shades of meanings. "The whole aim of Newspeak is to narrow the range of thought[.] In the end we shall make thought-crime literally impossible, because there will be no words in which to express it" (p. 46). The imaginative aspect of existing authors will be expunged: "By 2050 -- earlier, probably --... the whole literature of the past will have been destroyed. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Byron -- they'll exist only in Newspeak versions, not merely changed into something different, but actually changed into something contradictory of what they used to be" (p. 47). They must be reversed, for each embodies the highest reaches of imaginative expression, and the imaginative epitomizes freedom, the ability of the mind to range widely, to explore possibilities and impossibilities, to give a new structrue to life. All this is anathema to a totalitarian regime.

Poetry no longer exists -- only the verse manufactured or reshaped by the Party. Poetry gives a sense of order to things, and the Party reserves all ordering of life to itself. And there is no more story. There is still fiction -- Julia works in the Fiction Department in the Ministry of Truth, helping produce novels, not by imagination, but by novel-writing machines. The novels, presumably, are like the machine-produced pornography: "Ghastly rubbish.... They only have six plots,but they swap

them around a bit" (p. 109). Image, metaphor, symbol become unthinkable, in the literal sense that one cannot think them: the new language makes it impossible. So too it is impossible to have or experience, myth. Myths are narratives whose use of language and structure enable them to embody universal human truths and to convey these truths directly to the imagination. Everything in Party-think makes myth impossible. Narrative sequence no longer exists: things do not have beginnings and endings and coherence and thus meaning -- they simply happen randomly and are recorded, unless and until the Party decides that they did not happen, apparently, just as randomly. Language and scene no longer can embody universal truth: language is either wholly and simply concrete and literal, involving concrete objects or physical actions, or abstract terminology used to convey Party ideology, which is the only truth in existence. And imagination withers like an unused limb until soon, even if it could encounter myth, it would be incapable of recognizing or responding to it. Perhaps this is the ultimate form the abolition of man can take: not that human beings are enslaved physically, but that their freedom to imagine -- to dream, to aspire, to experience truth and beauty -- is removed.

The intriguing thing is that, in communicating this danger to myth, Orwell creates what may be the most powerful of twentieth-century myths. Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four exhibit the characteristics of myth Lewis set forth in An Experiment in Criticism, the former almost perfectly, the latter in a somewhat flawed fashion. Both are narratives whose shape or course of action, rather than particular telling or style, imprint upon the imagination a powerful humnman or divine truth. [8] A myth, Lewis says, is capable of summary, and even in summary form, conveys its power and vitality. That is true for both Orwell stories: they have come to emblemize a whole complex of contemporary reality even for people who have never read them. They have vividly etched on the imaginations of the western world truths about moral-political-human attitudes and relationships more powerfully, it seems, than the works of any other twentieth-century writer, because only Orwell was able to turn those ideas and concerns into myth. Lewis recognized and appreciated the absolute perfection of Animal Farm as myth: "There is not a sentence that does not contribute to the whole. The myth says all the author wants it to say and (equally important) it doesn't say anything else." (Literature, p. 104) But he apparently failed to recognize the mythical power of Nineteen Eighty-Four. In discussing it, Lewis dwelt on its formal imperfections -- its wordiness, its extraneous elements, its unappealing characterizations; he could not understand why it was better known, in the mid-'50s, than Animal Farm and could not appreciate the way it captured the imaginations of readers (Ibid., p. 101-103). Perhaps, ironically enough, he failed to notice that it, like That Hideous Strength, is a "Fairy-Tale for Grown Ups," a fantasy which would have appeal and effect despite weaknesses in its telling.

In contrast to the story in Nineteen Eighty-Four about the effort to destroy myth, That Hideous Strength as a story is an effort to reestablish a myth. Lewis too recognizes the danger implicit in the destruction of myth. In The Abolition of Man he protests against the methods of education which cultivate the intellect but stultify the imagination, as the faculty both for generating and appreciating myth. "The task of the modern educator is not to cut down jungles but to irrigate deserts.... By starving the sensibility of our pupils we only make them easier prey to the propagandist when he comes." (p. 24) He demonstrates the results of such education in Cosser, the utterly mechanized sociologist, and in Mark, whose education "had been neither scientific nor classical -- merely 'Modern.' The severities both of abstraction and of high human tradition had passed him by" and who would be exactly like Cosser were it not forthe influence of his wife Jane. (THS, pp. 84-87 and 185)

Lewis' answer to this and to the treat of the Hideous Strength generally, is to return to the "Old Western" mythology, the belief (common to western culture until the nineteenth century) in an orderly universe, human reason, and objective value. [9] He had spelled out this alternative to modern ideas and values throughout the Ransom trilogy, beginning with Out of the Silent Planet, where Ransom learned about the existence, and immanence, and the influence of spiritual beings, learned to call the universe "the heavens" (full of life and light, the womb of the worlds) rather than "space" (dark, empty, barren), and learned the importance of hierarchies, trust, and obedience. Ransom's experience on Malacandra in Out of the Silent Planet prepared him for a journey to Perelandra, where he helped the Green Lady hold onto the "Old Western" life in its pure form, by resisting the temptaion to disobey Maladil and accept the ways of the twentieth-century world. All this comes to bear on the final book of the trilogy, where the importance of the "Old Western" mythology is brought out through contrast, as attention focuses on a group of men and women totally devoid of and opposed to the good and decent ideas and values embodied in the "Old Western" myth. The conflict between good and evil, "Old Western" and modern, traditional and "progressive" reaches its climax in the scenes where Frost attempts to bring Mark into the Inner Circle of the N.I.C.E.. In the "Objective Room," Frost exposes Mark to disproportion, ugliness, and abnormality in an effort to destroy the innate tendency to prefer proportion, beauty, and the "Normal," for such "Normal" responses, to Lewis, are basic to one's humanity. In Mark's case the effort is unsuccessful -- he is attracted by and drawn to Order and Goodness and Truth and thus preserves his humanity, and is on his way toward the salvation of his soul.

It is intriguing, in the case of That Hideous Strength, that the story in which Lewis shows the need for myth does not achieve the qualities of myth itself. The story lacks the simple, satisfying shape of myth: it is complicated, difficult to hold in mind or summarize, and overly long -- Lewis himself prepared a shortened version for Avon books in 1946. It does not appeal primarily to the imagination, and lacks powerful images that remain planted in the memory. It conveys a theme of lasting human significance, but does so to a considerable extent by telling rather than showing characteristics of myth at its best. Marjorie Nicolson wrote, concerning Out of the Silent Planet, that "Mr.Lewis has created myth itself, myth woven of desires and aspirations deep-seated in some, at least, of the human race.... As I journey with him into worlds at once familiar and strange, I experience, as did Ransom, 'a sensation not of following an adventure but of enacting a myth.'" [10] That Hideous Strength demonstrates the dangers faced by human civilation if such experiences are lost. But ironically enough, That Hideous Strength, unlike Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four, does not itself enact a myth and has not become a vital part of twentieth-century mythology, perhaps because what

Ms.Nicolson says of Perelandra is also true of it, that "the Christian apologist has temporarily eclipsed the poet and the artist." (Ibid., p. 251n)

The similarities and differences between Lewis and Orwell as persons, between their responses to totalitarianism, and between their uses and attitudes toward myth come to focus, finally, on the degree of optimism each projects. Orwell, in Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-Four seems to offer little hope. The last man in Europe succumbs; at the endof the book Winston Smith is a pathetic figure -- an alcoholic, broken in body, mind, and spirit. With that the Party's victory seems complete; no one can or will escape the tyranny. Yet Orwell himself was not without hope. The book is warning, not prediction. He apparently had faith that the solid, old English traits he discussed in The Lion and the Unicorn [11] would see his country through this threat, if only it were on guard against the danger. That Hideous Strength, on the contrary, has a fairy-tale ending: the Good overcomes the Evil and all is well. But the victory is too easy to be convincing and satisfying realistically. If an organization like the N.I.C.E actually began to gain a foothold, one wants to protest, clairvoyant dreams and Arthurian figures are not going to come along and sweep it away. Lewis is less optimistic when he treats the same topics in an essay entitled "Is Progress Possible?" It concludes by asking "whether we can discover any way of submitting to the world-wide paternalism of a technocracy [which seems best able to handle the desperate problems the world faces] without losing all personal privacy and independence." (God in the Dock, p. 316) He supplies no answer to the question. The most that can be said, perhaps, is that the hope for both lies in myth: so long as the kind of myth Animal Farm and Nineteen Eighty-four are can be created and circulated, and so long as respect for, and even minimal adherence to, the Old Western myth remains, we can have confidence that the danger represented by totalitarianism will be held at bay.

NOTES

[1] C.S Lewis, "George Orwell," On Stories and Other Essays on Literature, ed. Walter Hooper (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), pp. 101-104. Hereafter Literature

[2] The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, 4 vol. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968), III, 262. Hereafter Essays.

[3] See Bernard Crick, George Orwell: A Life (London: Secker and Warburg, 1980), and on C.S. Lewis, Surprised by Joy (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1955); also Roger Lancelyn Green and Walter Hooper, C.S. Lewis: A Biography (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974).

[4] George Orwell, Nineteen Eighty-Four (1949; rpt. New York: New American Library, 1950), p. 222. Hereafter 1984

[5] George Orwell, Animal Farm (1946; rpt. New York: New American Library, 1956), p. 123.

[6] From a press release prepared by his publisher from notes Orwell dictated in June, 1949; quoted in Crick, George Orwell, p. 395.

[7] The quote is from "Is Progress Possible?", God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics, ed. Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p.315. For Lewis on the social sciences, see That Hideous Strength, pp. 70-71 and "The Humanitarian Theory of Punishment," God in the Dock, pp.287-300. On "scientism," see "A Reply to Professor Haldane," On Stories, pp. 69-72; in the remainder of that essay, Lewis discusses the themes and intention of That Hideous Strength.

[8] An Experiment in Criticism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961)

[9] See Lewis' inaugural lecture as the Professor of Medieval and Renaissance English Literature at Cambridge University, 1955: "'De Descriptione Temporum,'" Selected Literary Essays, ed. Walter Hooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 1-14. The "Old Western" characteristics are elaborated in Lewis' The Discarded Image (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), esp. Chapters 5 and 7, and more briefly in "Imagination and Thought in the Middle Ages," Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature, ed. Walter Hooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), pp. 41-63.

[10] Nicolson,Voyages to the Moon (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 254-55.

[11] The Lion and the Unicorn (1941) is reprinted in The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell, II, 56-109. The opening section, "England Your England," is available in The Orwell Reader (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956) and George Orwell, A Collection of Essays (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954) and thus is comparatively well known; the latter two sections, "Shopkeepers at War" and "The English Revolution," important to a full understanding of Orwell's thought, have unfortunely been neglected.

Rites of Passage in The Hobbit, continued from page 8

heart, firm of purpose and will, and who has a real quarrel with the dragon, is able to defeat it.

The Hobbit, then, is a book for children, which amongst many things of wonder and horror, takes them through the maturation process with the hero, and shows them what they must face and how they must face it to win through to full maturation and realize their true potential. The Hobbit is also a book for adults. It is a mythic novel, which traces the path of the hero from his calling, through his initiation into psychic/spiritual maturity and wholeness, to his return from his experiences with his shadow at the roots of his being, and his defeat of the darkness and evil both within and without. Because of his development and maturation, Bilbo goes on to save his friends from death, imprisonment and their own evil, as a true hero should. The ring becomes an externalization of the internal sources of power (confidence, courage, pity and compassion), tapped and discovered through Bilbo's experiences under the mountains and in Mirkwood. But unlike many of the heroes of old, Bilbo is easy for the reader to identify with because of his simple humanity. He shows us our own potential for such realization and wholeness within ourselves. It is a great mythopoeic story, drawing out our hidden fears and showing us a way into ourselves that, for many, is obscured. But perhaps the greatest "message" of this story is hope. The hope that we can find ourselves and that in finding that wholeness, we can help create a better world, a world in which we may all learn to value "food and cheer and song above [all forms of] hoarded gold."

Betteheim, Bruno. The Uses of Enchantment: The Meaning and Importance of Fairy Tales. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Campbell, Joseph. The Hero With a Thousand Faces. Princeton, N.J.:Princeton University Press, 1968.

Tolkien, J.R.R.. The Hobbit. London: Allen & Unwin, 1966.